

REMARKS

Claims 6-15 are pending in this application. The Examiner rejected claims 6-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Guheen et al. (Guheen). Claim 6 is illustrative and recites:

A system for making computer-implemented multiple life cycle plans, comprising:  
a user interface including data entry elements for receiving life cycle planning data from a user and displaying plan results to the user; and  
a planning engine, coupled to the user interface, and configured to perform the steps of:  
allocating the planning data to a plurality of items, each item having at least one variable, and each item configured to be present in or absent from each life cycle plan; and  
determining a plan result for each plan using only the items that are present in the plan.

The claimed invention enables efficient development and comparison between multiple life cycle plans without requiring complete duplication of prior plans. Because items can be active in multiple plans, multiple copies of the same item need not be made for each different plan a user wishes to construct. Using the claimed invention, a user can evaluate the effects of different life choices and different economic assumptions, and can see the results those differences make to each plan.

Guheen does not disclose the claimed invention. Guheen provides a system, method and article of manufacture "for identifying alliances among a plurality of business entities in components of a network framework." (Abstract). Guheen bears no relationship whatsoever to the claimed invention for developing life cycle plans. The Examiner argues that Guheen teaches "a user interface including data entry elements for receiving life cycle planning data from a user and displaying plan results to the user" at Fig. 57. In fact, Fig. 57 illustrates "a model migration plan" for mapping out a progression of software configuration packages throughout a systems development life cycle. (Col. 48, lines 9-14). Clearly, a road map for deploying software packages in an enterprise environment does not even remotely suggest, let alone anticipate, a UI for planning a life cycle of a user. While it is true that both people and software packages have "life cycles", planning data related to a person's life cycle (college, children, retirement, etc.) is quite different than planning for the deployment of a software upgrade.


BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The additional portions of Guheen cited by the Examiner also fail to anticipate the claimed invention. For example, the planning engine of the claimed invention allocates planning data to a plurality of items present or absent from life cycle plans, and determines a plan result for each plan using the items that are present. In contrast, the "Configuration Management" team in the portion of Guheen cited by the Examiner as anticipating the claimed planning engine states that "[i]n other words, the team is responsible for maintaining the integrity of software and critical documents as they evolve through the delivery life cycle from analysis through deployment." Again, neither this passage nor any other in Guheen teaches, suggests or discloses the claimed invention for making computer-implemented multiple life cycle plans, and claim 6 is patentable over Guheen.

The Examiner did not specifically address any of the remaining claims, claims 7-15. As a result, Applicant is unable to discern the Examiner's reasons for rejecting those claims, which include additional features not referenced by the Examiner in Guheen and which, at a minimum, are patentable over Guheen for at least the same reasons as claim 6. The Examiner is therefore asked to withdraw the rejection of claims 7-15 both because he has made no *prima facie* showing of unpatentability under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), see MPEP §§ 706.02(a), 707.07(d), and because the claims are patentable over Guheen.

In view of the above, the Examiner is asked to withdraw his rejection of all pending claims, claims 6-15, and issue a Notice of Allowance. If any matters remain outstanding prior to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (415) 875-2358 or via e-mail at [dbrownstone@fenwick.com](mailto:dbrownstone@fenwick.com). Applicant acknowledges that a copy of any electronic mail communications will be made of record in the application file per MPEP § 502.03.

Respectfully submitted,  
George Hansen

Date: August 30, 2004 By: 

Daniel R. Brownstone, Reg. No. 46,581  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel: (415) 875-2358  
Fax: (415) 281-1350